



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/923,320	08/08/2001	Anita Hogans Simpson	BS01-066	1966

38516 7590 05/09/2006
SCOTT P. ZIMMERMAN, PLLC
PO BOX 3822
CARY, NC 27519

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, DUSTIN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/923,320	SIMPSON, ANITA HOGANS	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dustin Nguyen	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-48 and 51-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-48 and 51-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-48 and 51-54 are presented for examination. Claims 2, 49-50 and 55-57 have been cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 02/27/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. As per remarks, Applicants' argued that (1) Gudjonsson fails to teach or suggest the amended limitations of "monitoring a total number of users who log in to a website" and "comparing the total number of users to notification criteria of the offline user".

4. As to point (1), Gudjonsson discloses a system that provides each user the ability to monitor the status/presence of a given set of other users [i.e. monitoring a total number of users who log in to a website] [col 3, lines 6-9 and lines 37-45; and col 8, lines 60-63] and a user can be aware of the online status of users in his/her buddy list or contact list [i.e. group of user or the total number of user] and get notification when these user's status(es) changes and the ability to look for other user's identities using queries by name or other useful criteria [i.e. comparing the total number of users to notification criteria of the offline user] [col 8, lines 63-65] and the

Art Unit: 2154

notification to user can be made through pager or mobile phone [Abstract; and col 25, lines 21- col 26, lines 29].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1, 3-48 and 51-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. The claim language in the following claims is not clearly explained:

I. Claims 1, 20, 30, 40, 42, 48, 51, claim the comparison step between the total number of users to a particular number of users that log in to the website, and sending a notification when the total number of users exceeds a preset amount, it is not clearly defined what relationship exists between “a particular number of user” and “a preset amount”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

8. Claims 1, 7-20, 24-30, 34-40, 42, 44, 46-48, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gudjonsson et al. [US Patent No 6,564,261].

9. As per claim 1, Gudjonsson discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a method for notifying an offline user of an online user [i.e. the network enables any of the communication services between users, and the initiating user need not know whether the other user is currently online via his/her PC or may instead be reached via pager or mobile phone] [Abstract; and col 13, lines 29-38], the method comprising the steps of:

monitoring the total numbers of users who log in to a website [i.e. monitor the status/presence of a given set of other users and be notified of any changes thereof] [col 8, lines 60-63];

as each user logs in, comparing the total number of users to notification criteria of the offline user [i.e. the ability to look for other user's identities using queries by name or other useful criteria] [col 8, lines 63-65], the notification criteria specifying a particular number of

Art Unit: 2154

users that logs in to the website [i.e. the user can be aware of the online status of users in his/her buddy list and get notification when these user's status changes] [col 3, lines 1-13 and lines 38-45]; and

when the total number of users exceeds a preset amount [i.e. getting a notification whenever another user adds him/her to the other user's contact list] [col 35, lines 65-col 36, lines 6], then sending a notification to the offline user [i.e. instruct to forward messages to his/her mobile phone when he's not online] [Figure 4; col 10, lines 7-22], wherein the notification informs the offline user of an amount of activity in the website [i.e. PC to phone, notify Ann [off-line] that Carl is at his computer and wants to voice chat with Anne] [col 25, lines 43-63].

10. As per claim 8, Gudjonsson discloses sending an offline communication to the offline user in accordance with the offline user's contact information [i.e. forwarded to GSM phone] [col 25, lines 43-64].

11. As per claim 9, Gudjonsson discloses communication device type and an address of the communication device [col 22, lines 64-col 23, lines 11].

12. As per claim 10, Gudjonsson discloses a plurality of communication device types of the offline user [col 33, lines 5-30], addresses for each of the plurality of communication device types [col 1, lines 40-col 2, lines 15], and an order in which to attempt the plurality of

Art Unit: 2154

communication device types [i.e. user specified the types of message deliveries] [col 33, lines 31-48].

13. As per claim 11, Gudjonsson discloses sending the offline communication to one of a wireline telephone, a wireless telephone, a caller identification device, a wireless access protocol device, a one-way pager, and an interactive page [col 3, lines 22-28].

14. As per claim 12, Gudjonsson discloses receiving an indication from the offline user as to whether the offline user will log in to the website [i.e. accept or decline]; and reporting the indication to the online user [i.e. send a declining message] [col 25, lines 21-42].

15. As per claim 7, Gudjonsson discloses reporting the indication to another offline user [i.e. choose multiple recipients for a message] [col 36, lines 35-40].

16. As per claim 13, Gudjonsson discloses wherein the step of sending the offline communication comprises sending the offline communication to one of a wireline telephone and a wireless telephone [col 3, lines 22-28],

wherein the step of receiving the indication comprises receiving input of the offline user through an interactive voice response unit, and wherein the step of reporting the indication comprise transmitting the indication to the online user through a global computer network [col 9, lines 41-col 10, lines 22].

Art Unit: 2154

17. As per claim 14, Gudjonsson discloses receiving audio input of the offline user and converting the audio input to text for transmission through the global computer network to the online user [i.e. translating signal protocol] [col 10, lines 10-16; and col 3, lines 6-30].

18. As per claim 15, Gudjonsson discloses receiving audio input of the offline user, recording the audio input as a digital audio file, and transmitting the digital audio file through the global computer network to the online user [col 34, lines 37-49; and col 37, lines 59-67].

19. As per claim 16, Gudjonsson discloses sending the offline communication to one of an interactive pager and a wireless access protocol device [col 39, lines 18-20],

wherein the step of receiving the indication comprises receiving input of the offline user from the interactive pager or the wireless access protocol device, and wherein the step of reporting the indication comprises transmitting the indication to the online user through the global computer network [i.e. invitation reply] [col 23, lines 50-col 24, lines 15].

20. As per claim 17, Gudjonsson discloses one of a standard message [col 22, lines 41-45] and a customized message [col 10, lines 64-col 11, lines 4].

21. As per claim 18, Gudjonsson discloses the notification criteria and a time and a date that the notification criteria was satisfied [col 32, lines 36-48; and col 36, lines 47-55].

Art Unit: 2154

22. As per claim 19, Gudjonsson discloses requiring the offline user to provide a passcode before forwarding the offline communication [col 31, lines 43-58].

23. As per claim 20, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1.

24. As per claims 24-29, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 8-13.

25. As per claim 30, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1.

26. As per claims 34-39, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 8-13.

27. As per claim 40, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1.

28. As per claim 42, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1.

29. As per claim 44, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 8.

30. As per claims 46 and 47, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 11 and 12.

31. As per claims 48, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1 and 13.

Furthermore, Gudjonsson discloses instant messaging service [col 2, lines 16-23].

32. As per claim 55, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1. Furthermore, Gudjonsson discloses telephone call [col 25, lines 6-20].

33. As per claim 56, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 11.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

34. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

35. Claims 3, 4, 21, 22, 31, 32, 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gudjonsson et al. [US Patent No 6,564,261], in view of Payne et al. [US Patent No 6,021,433].

36. As per claim 3, Gudjonsson discloses the website is a chat room [i.e. chat session] [Abstract]. Gudjonsson does not specifically disclose a topic of discussion. Payne discloses a topic of discussion [i.e. category] [col 21, lines 21-44]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Gudjonsson

Art Unit: 2154

and Payne because Payne's teaching of category would enhance the system by provide a variety of information for users to communicate with each other.

37. As per claim 4, Gudjonsson does not specifically disclose the website is a game site and the notification criteria further comprise when a high score has been exceeded. Payne discloses the website is a game site [col 21, lines 21-44] and the notification criteria further comprise when a high score has been exceeded [col 28, lines 29-30]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Gudjonsson and Payne because Payne's teaching of game site would allow to implement the system on variety of applications to increase its value.

38. As per claims 21 and 22, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 3 and 4.

39. As per claims 31 and 32, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 3 and 4.

40. As per claim 45, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 3.

Art Unit: 2154

41. Claims 5, 6, 23, 33, 41, 43, 51-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gudjonsson et al. [US Patent No 6,564,261], in view of Gupta et al. [US Patent No 6,763,384].

42. As per claim 5, Gudjonsson does not specifically disclose the website is an auction site and the notification criteria comprise entry of a bid that exceeds a high bid submitted by the offline user. Gupta discloses the website is an auction site and the notification criteria comprise entry of a bid that exceeds a high bid submitted by the offline user [Abstract; and col 8, lines 12-28]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Gudjonsson and Gupta because Gupta's teaching of auction site would allow provide up to date status of valuable information for users.

43. As per claim 6, Gupta discloses the website is an auction site and the notification criteria comprises a number of bids submitted within a certain duration [col 1, lines 26-34].

44. As per claim 23, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 5.

45. As per claim 33, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 5.

46. As per claim 41, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 3-5.

47. As per claim 43, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 3-5.

48. As per claims 51 and 52, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1, 5 and 6.

49. As per claim 53, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 12.

50. As per claim 54, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 5.

51. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3971. The examiner can normally be reached on flex schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Follansbee John can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100
Dustin Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2154